DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 764 CS 502 151

AUTHOR Leckenby, John D.; Surlin, Stuart H.
TITLE The Authoritarian Dimension of Entertainment Television.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 25-29, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authoritarianism; *Broadcast Television; Changing Attitudes; College Students; *Commercial Television; *Dogmatism; Racial Attitudes; *Social Values; Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Response

ABSTRACT

Some critics of broadcasting assert that the authoritarian dimension of entertainment television encourages viewer passivity and the uncritical acceptance of negative social values on the part of some viewers. This paper reviews the research on this topic and presents two new studies that tested the authoritarian impact of entertainment television. The first study questioned two randomly selected groups of viewers on items designed to assess the consciousness raising effect and reinforcement impact of one particular television program, "All in the Family." Subject responses were analyzed according to region, race, and agreement with Archie Bunker's attitudes. The second study measured the dogmatic characteristics of 206 college students as these characteristics related to opinion change. The first study revealed a significant correlation between the authoritarianism of the viewer and the impact of the program. This finding was further supported by the second study which showed that high authoritarian viewers are influenced more in their opinions by high authoritarian characters than by low authoritarian characters. Results of both studies support the view that television can be used to legitimize the antisocial opinions of certain viewers. (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155764

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Authoritarian Dimension of Entertainment Television

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John D. Leckenby
Stuart H. Surlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

John D. Leckenby

College of Communications
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois 61801

and

Stuart H. Surlin

Department of Communication Studies
The University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, Canada

International Communication Association
Mass Communication Division
Chicago, Illinois

April 1978

CS502 151

The Authoritarian Dimension of Entertainment Television

Recent commentary on entertainment television has sometimes pointed to the possible authoritarian role it plays in society. Emphasizing this concept in much of his broadcast criticism, Michael J. Arlen concluded, in the pages of The New Yorker, that the single most outstanding aspect of television in our era is its largely authoritarian nature.[1] He suggests that ". . .'power' on the part of the television establishment and 'passivity' on the part of the audience have been perhaps the two key words, or concepts, with which to consider the influence of television up to now in our society."

In another of his essays, Arlen found the entertainment television experience to be similar to the typical air travel situation.[2] The traveler is requested to sit in a particular seat and fasten the seatbelt so that it is not possible to move about freely. Refreshments and food are served only when those in charge determine it is appropriate. The restroom may be used only when the captain gives the relevant signal. The passenger is expected to remain quiescent during the trip so as not to disturb either those in control or fellow passengers. In short, the air travel experience requires passivity on the part of the traveler and activity on the part of those in authority. Similarly, the television viewer is expected not to converse during the experience so that fellow viewers may concentrate on the fare. Refreshment and restroom activities should take place, on signal from the broadcaster, primarily during the commercial interruption. Passivity is required so that the television "message" can get across.

Though some critics believe all or most of television is of an authoritarian nature, clearly there appears to be some differentiation across the various genre of television fare. "Talk" shows seem to develop a wide following by

involving the viewer in the media event; viewers are encouraged to call the host and participate with the guests and studio audience. Somewhat less involving, but still providing some stimulation for the viewer to be active, are the game shows. The viewer is encouraged to "think" along with the contestants to give the correct answer. In contrast, much of the situation comedy and drama requires little personal involvement on the part of the viewer. Indeed, many of the topics covered, such as interracial marriage, are those with which the viewer has had no prior personal experience. There has also been a trend in such programming to make the topics "socially relevant." This has often taken the form of such highly authoritarian characters as "Archie Bunker" and "George Jefferson." This type of "socially relevant" entertainment television serves as the focus of the present study; it is in such programming that the authoritarian nature of entertainment television may be most visible.

Recent Research on Entertainment Television and Authoritarianism

Much of the empirical work in this area has specifically been concerned with the impact of programs such as "All in the Family" on the learning of negative attitudes about racial matters. Surlin has recently reviewed five years of research dealing with this program which covers cultural effects, viewing frequency effects, and reinforcements effects.[3] Most interest has been with the latter effect-type and is usually concerned with the role of perceived similarity of the viewer and "Archie Bunker." A series of studies has shown that viewers high in authoritarianism/dogmatism tend to agree, in general, with the views of "Archie" and like him more than those low in this personality characteristic; these relationships have been found in a variety of settings, including those of a cross-cultural nature.[4] Leckenby has shown that low dogmatic viewers attribute higher levels of dogmatism to "Archie"

than to other characters whereas high dogmatic viewers attribute about the same level of dogmatism to several different characters. This study also showed that high dogmatic viewers perceive their viewpoints to be more similar to "Archie" than to less dogmatic characters.[5]

Surlin and Tate studied humor in "All in the Family" and found that, for high authoritarian viewers, the hostility toward other characters expressed by Archie in a humorous manner facilitated the identification with him.[6] Other studies have shown that viewers who hold conservative viewpoints on issues such as integration and women's rights tend to agree more with Archie, like him more, and see him as "winning" compared to viewers holding more liberal viewpoints.[7] In addition, those viewers who could be characterized as "marginal men" of the society and who are high in alientation tend to accept the viewpoints illustrated on "All in the Family" and are more frequent viewers of the program than others.[8]

Among several others, two important questions may be raised as a result of the preceding research. First, how salient is the authoritarian/dogmatic dimension of personality in explaining differential perceptions of such entertainment television relative to other non-personality factors of viewers? And secondly, can the impact of this type of programming on viewer opinions be explained, in part, by the dogmatism demonstrated by television characters and the dogmatism of viewers? This paper presents a study which concentrated on the first question and a subsequent study which dealt with the latter question.

Authoritarianism/Dogmatism Research and Hypotheses

To provide a basis for setting hypotheses, the literature in both the dogmatism and authoritarianism concepts was utilized. Though there are conceptual differences in these concepts, empirically they tend to be moderately to highly correlated.[9]

Studies by Scodel and Mussen,[10] Crockett and Meidinger,[11] Rabinowitz[12] and Jones[13] suggest that high authoritarians consistently over-estimate the amount of a personality characteristic other individuals possess. These studies also have shown that individuals high in authoritarianism tend not to differentiate accurately among different individual's personality characteristics. In addition to these studies, Newcomb[14] and the review by Christie and Cook[15] provide support for the notion that high authoritarians tend to attribute their own levels of authoritarianism to others whereas low authoritarians tend to attribute F scores midway between their own scores and those whom they are judging. Studies reviewed by Ehrlich and Lee[16] point out the implications of this finding: high dogmatic individuals tend to change their attitudes toward a topic more than do low dogmatics when the source of the message is similar to themselves (high in authoritarianism).

The studies reported above on entertainment television indicate that agreement with Archie is a surrogate measure of authoritarianism. High authoritarian viewers consistently agree more in general with the views of Archie than do low authoritarian viewers. In explaining differential perception to the programs and characters, the results are almost identical when viewers are categorized by high/low generalized agreement with Archie or by high/low authoritarianism or dogmatism.[17]

Based upon these series of studies, hypotheses were set for each of the two studies reported here: 1) viewer authoritarianism more consistently predicts differential perception of television entertainment programs than does viewer race or region of the country in which the viewer resides; 2) of several attributions to characters on TV programs (interpersonal attraction, character reliability, perceived viewpoint commonality, generalized agreement, and character dogmatism), attributed dogmatism is most important in showing viewer perceptions of the differences in characters; 3) low dogmatic viewers perceive

differences between themselves and different characters on the dogmatism dimension and, therefore, change their opinions on a topic more when it is advocated by a character perceived to be close to themselves in dogmatism (high perceived commonality) than to a character perceived to be farther from themselves (low perceived commonality); and 4) high dogmatic viewers do not discriminate between characters in terms of perceived commonality and, therefore, change their opinions the same amount when the topic is advocated by different characters.

Method

Study One

A sample of viewers was obtained from Athens, Georgia, and from Champaign-Urbana, Illinois. The selection of respondents was based on the 1970 United States Census tracts for each city. Six tracts were selected judgmentally in each of the cities so that roughly equivalent numbers of black and white residents would be represented in the samples. The tracts were also selected so that socio-economic middle and lower levels were equivalently represented.

The selected tracts were outlined on a map of streets for each city. The streets which were contained within each of the tracts were listed, and, through the use of a street-ordered telephone directory, telephone numbers were selected by a systematic random process. In the Athens sample, 309 completed interviews were obtained from 587 numbers selected; 120 successfully completed interviews were obtained in the Champaign-Urbana sample of the 198 numbers selected. For the 400 people actually contacted in Athens, the completion rate was 77 percent. The completion rate was 79 percent in the Champaign-Urbana sample (158 people actually contacted).

Of the 309 respondents in the Athens sample, 157 were black and 152 were white; 60 of the 120 respondents in the Champaign-Urbana sample were black and 60 were white. Thus for comparisons based upon race and region of residence,

there were 217 blacks, 212 whites, 120 respondents from the north, and 309 respondents from the south.

Cognitive similarity with Archie Bunker was operationalized through the response to this item: "I generally agree with Archie Bunker's point of view." Subjects responded on a five-interval Likert scale running from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". Respondents were categorized into either an "agree" group (including both "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses) and a "non-agree" group (all other responses). There were 112 "agrees" and 317 "non-agrees" in the total sample of 429.

The dependent variables in this study were measured on five-interval Likert items running from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". Respondents were asked to respond separately for three programs: "All in the Family," "Good Times," and "The Jeffersons." Two Likert items for each of the programs were presented: 1) how strongly the respondents believed each program was entertaining; and 2) how strongly the respondents believed each program revealed how the types of people shown on the programs behave in real life. Two additional Likert items were asked for "All in the Family." Subjects were asked to indicate how strongly they believed each of the following statements: "Viewing 'All in the Family' makes me more aware of my own opinions about what is happening in the world today" and "The more I watch 'All in the Family', the more I find myself agreeing with Archie." These items were intended to assess the consciousness raising effect of the program as well as its impact on reinforcement of cognitive structure.

Study Two

Subjects in the second study were enrolled in the introductory advertising course and were sophomores or juniors in the College of Communications at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. A total of 214 students participated in the experiment; of this total, 206 students were retained for final

analyses on the basis of their accurate identification (open-ended) of each of the two characters included in the study.

Subjects were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups. One group read a message attributed as dialogue to "Archie Bunker" while the other group read the same message attributed as dialogue for "Kojak." These two characters were selected for study since previous research showed attributed dogmatism to be highest for Archie and lowest for Kojak of the four characters studied.[18] The message utilized under both treatment conditions strongly attacked The New York Times for its racial stance based upon an alleged unfavorable incident involving one of its star reporters and bussing of races. The Times was selected as the object of the message since, for many college students, its integrity amounts to a cultural truism. Therefore, any opinion changes on this object would presumably reflect fairly strong influences of each of the two characters studied.

Subjects in each condition completed ten-itemdogmatism scales from the viewpoint of Archie and from the viewpoint of Kojak.[19] They also completed this scale from their own standpoint. The ten items were summed for each respondent in each case to provide dogmatism scores for each subject and their attributed dogmatism scores for each of the two characters. Before and after reading the dialogue, subjects completed three semantic differential scales: Great/Not Great, Reliable/Unreliable, and Incompetent/Competent. These were summed pre-exposure and post-exposure to form an opinion score towards the New York Times. The absolute value of the difference between the pre-exposure and post-exposure scores was taken for each subject to form opinion change scores.

Subjects also indicated how reliable they felt each of the two characters was with respect to the performance of the news media by checking a Reliable/Unreliable semantic differentialscale for each of the characters. Finally,

they completed two Likert items for each character: one item assessing "liking" of the characters and another which assessed general agreement with the characters. These were utilized as measures of interpersonal attraction and generalized agreement, respectively.

The variables of interest in the second study were: a) Attributed Dogmatism for each of the two characters; b) Subject Dogmatism: 3) Perceived Commonality (absolute value of the difference between Attributed and Subject Dogmatism); d) Interpersonal Attraction; 3) Generalized Agreement; f) Character Reliability; and g) Opinion Change in each condition.

Results

Study One

Table 1 shows the responses to the eight dependent variables in Study One on the basis of race, region of residence, and generalized agreement with Archie. Three-way analyses of variance were conducted for each of the eight variables where the three factors were region, race, and agreement with Archie (the surrogate indicator of subject authoritarianism in this study). There were no significant ($p < .05$) three-way interactions. For three of the eight analyses, there were significant ($p < .05$) two-way interactions between race and region. These were for "All in the Family is entertaining," "All in the Family reveals real behavior," and "The Jeffersons reveals real behavior." In general, these three viewer characteristics appear to be independent with respect to the program perceptions elicited from respondents. The main effects are appropriate indicators in this instance, and, therefore, t tests were conducted for each of the eight variables.

Table 1 shows clearly that authoritarianism (agreement versus non-agreement with Archie) is the most consistent indicator of differential perceptions of each of the three programs. The high authoritarians agreed significantly

Table 1

Program Perceptions by Race, Region, and Agreement with Archie
(N=429)

Dependent Variable	Race $\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$		Region $\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$		Agreement with Archie $\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	
	Black (n=217)	White (n=212)	t	South (n=309)	North (n=120)	t	High (n=112)	Low (n=317)	t
Entertaining									
"All in the Family"	1.92	2.02	1.21	1.95	2.03	.91	1.81	2.03	2.26*
"Good Times"	1.57	1.50	.81	1.51	1.58	.61	1.58	1.82	2.83**
"The Jeffersons"	1.63	1.42	1.58	1.48	1.65	1.15	2.02	2.36	2.47*
Reveals Real Behavior									
"All in the Family"	2.44	2.66	2.15*	2.47	2.74	2.41*	2.21	2.66	3.93**
"Good Times"	2.24	2.16	.63	2.13	2.38	1.77	2.20	2.54	3.63**
"The Jeffersons"	2.02	1.75	1.76	1.79	2.13	1.97*	2.44	2.94	3.35**
Heightens Own Opinions									
"All in the Family"	2.44	2.60	1.56	2.50	2.58	.79	2.15	2.65	4.46**
Watching and Agreement									
"All in the Family"	3.42	3.85	4.00**	3.48	4.02	4.51**	2.47	4.04	15.67**

*p .05
**p .01

more than the low authoritarians that the three programs are entertaining and revealing of real behavior of people. Further, the high authoritarians agreed more than the low authoritarian group that watching "All in the Family" makes them more aware of their own opinions (raises their consciousness). Approximating a longitudinal effect, the high authoritarians also agreed significantly more than the low authoritarians that the more they watched "All in the Family," the more they came to agree with Archie Bunker. This may indicate a stronger reinforcement effect of this program for the high authoritarians than for the low authoritarians.

The results for the authoritarian indicator are in contrast to the results for race and region. In only two of the eight instances are there significant differences between black and white respondents. In only three of the eight instances does region show any differences between north and south respondents on the eight dependent variables. The first hypothesis is fairly strongly supported. Differences in viewer authoritarianism are more consistent indicators of perceptions of various aspects of the entertainment television programs than are differences in viewer race or region. This finding parallels that of Leckenby and Surlin[20] which showed that alienation was a more consistent predictor of selective perception of similar programs than was socioeconomic status, race, or region. Since alienation and authoritarianism tend to be correlated, it seems that variables concerning cognitive similarity of viewers with characters may be more important than are physical characteristics of viewers and characters.[21]

Study Two

The results relevant to the last three hypotheses of this research are shown in Table 2. Consistent with previous studies in interpersonal settings as well as mass communication settings, the average attributions over the two

characters are in the usual direction. The high dogmatic viewers (defined as those above the median dogmatism score) attributed dogmatism levels to the characters about the same as they indicated for themselves. The average attribution over both characters was 44.66 while their own subject dogmatism score was 42.49. The low dogmatic respondents, however, attributed significantly higher scores on dogmatism (42.84) to the characters than their own subject dogmatism (33.55), $p < .01$.

The experimental treatment conditions had a significant effect on the experimental variable, opinion change scores. The mean opinion change for the Archie condition (n=122) was 1.11 while the mean opinion change for the Kojak condition (n=84) was 1.62. These scores are significantly different at the .05 level. Attributed dogmatism was significantly higher for Archie (47.18) than for Kojak (38.80), $p < .01$. The subject dogmatism was not significantly different across the treatment groups (37.90 and 38.30, respectively), thus making between-group comparisons appropriate.

Since there was a significant effect of the treatment, further analyses to test the hypotheses (two through four) were conducted. Table 2 shows the t test results across the two treatment groups for low dogmatic and high dogmatic subjects separately. All the attribution variables (Attributed Dogmatism, Perceived Commonality, Interpersonal Attraction, Generalized Agreement, and Character Reliability) as well as opinion change scores are significantly different across the treatment groups (Archie versus Kojak) for the low dogmatic respondents. Only Attributed Dogmatism and Generalized Agreement are significantly different ($P < .05$) for the high dogmatic subjects. Discriminant analyses (one for low dogmatic subjects and one for high dogmatics) showed that, of all five attribution variables, Attributed Dogmatism and Generalized Agreement were the most important perceived differences between the two characters (this is shown by the standardized discriminant coefficients in Table 2). This was the

Table 2

Opinion Change and Attribution Variables by Character Treatment and Subject Dogmatism
(N=206)

	High Dogmatic Subjects (n=102) $\bar{x}$				Low Dogmatic Subjects (n=104) $\bar{x}$			
	Archie Source (n=62)	Kojak Source (n=42)	t	1 *	Archie Source (n=60)	Kojak Source (n=42)	t	2 *
Subject Dogmatism	42.13	43.02	ns	--	33.53	33.57	ns	--
Opinion Change	1.52	1.48	ns	-	.70	1.76	2.72*	--
Attributed Dogmatism	47.31	40.76	4.52*	.39	47.05	36.83	7.68*	.40
Perceived Commonality	7.08	6.74	ns	.07	13.52	5.26	6.78*	.15
Interpersonal Attraction	3.03	3.45	ns	.24	2.88	3.52	3.24*	.04
Generalized Agreement	1.81	3.07	7.23*	.92	1.68	3.12	9.13*	.58
Character Reliability	2.64	2.71	ns	.07	2.37	3.57	4.06*	.14

*p .01
*=Standardized Discriminant Weights

[1]Wilk's Lambda=.57, Bartlett's Chi-square=55.1, d.f.=5, p .01

[2]Wilk's Lambda=.42, Bartlett's Chi-square=84.8, d.f.=5, p .01

case for both the low and high dogmatic subjects. The second hypothesis was confirmed by these data; dogmatism is an important part of the perceptual process with respect to differences viewers find in characters in entertainment programming of this nature.

The third hypothesis is also confirmed by the results in Table 2. The low dogmatic subjects have higher perceived commonality on the dogmatism characteristic with Kojak than with Archie (indicated by the smaller average score of 5.26 than the larger score of 13.52 for Archie). The low dogmatic respondents perceive themselves to be closer to Kojak than Archie with respect to dogmatism. As predicted in the hypothesis, the low dogmatic subjects also changed their opinion significantly more when Kojak was the character associated with the dialogue than when Archie was speaking (mean opinion change was 1.76 and .70, respectively), $p < .01$. Higher perceived commonality is accompanied by higher opinion change for the low dogmatic subjects.

The final hypothesis is also confirmed; there is no significant difference between the character treatments for the high dogmatic subjects on perceived commonality. These subjects feel equally close to Archie or Kojak. This is reflected in the opinion change scores for each character; there is no significant difference for the high dogmatic respondents in the amount of change relative to each of the two characters. The high dogmatic subjects apparently do not discriminate with respect to the differences between themselves and various characters; this is accompanied by equivalent influence of both characters on the high dogmatic viewer.

Finally, consistent with most of the findings in the studies of dogmatism and opinion change, the high dogmatic subjects had a significantly higher average opinion change (1.52) than did the low dogmatic subjects (.70) for the character (Archie) to which most dogmatism was attributed, $p < .01$. This is accompanied by higher mean perceived commonality (7.08) for the high dogmatic

subject group, p .01. There is no significant difference on perceived commonality for Kojak between low and high dogmatic groups. This is accompanied by roughly equivalent opinion change for this character; the mean opinion change for low dogmatic subjects was 1.76 compared to mean opinion change of 1.48 for the high dogmatic subjects, $p < .05$. This set of contrasts again illustrates that perceived commonality of the dogmatism characteristic between the viewer and the character may be an important factor governing the impact of entertainment programming on the cognitive structure of the viewer.

Conclusions

Some broadcast critics have suggested that entertainment television is characterized largely by its authoritarian dimension. They reason that this is dysfunctional in the social sense because it encourages viewer passivity and, thus, uncritical acceptance by some viewers of the viewpoints of those responsible for the programming (the "authorities"). Though the authorities do not talk directly to the viewer, their message is conveyed in entertainment programs through fictitious characters; these characters then become the authoritarian model for some viewers.

This paper has reviewed some of the empirical work in this area and presented two studies which attempt to empirically test the critics' view of entertainment television. The findings from the two studies provide evidence which largely supports the validity of this view. Authoritarianism is an important element of entertainment television from two perspectives. First, the authoritarianism which the viewer brings to the program in his own personality determines, in part, the perceptions of the program content. This factor has more to do with the manner in which the viewer perceives the program then does the race of the viewer or the special influences of the part of the country in which the viewer lives. Entertainment television may be partially responsible

for leveling out such influences. The first study reported here showed that the authoritarianism of the viewer is a salient part of entertainment television's impact.

This finding has a great deal to do with the role authoritarianism plays in the program content itself. The second study reported here showed that high authoritarian viewers are influenced more in their opinions by high authoritarian characters than by low authoritarian characters. Since one of the outstanding characteristics of authoritarianism is its close relationship to racist attitudes, it is significant that the study dealt with opinion change on a racial subject. Each character (one to whom subjects attributed high dogmatism and the other low dogmatism) gave the same piece of dialogue of a racist nature. The high dogmatic viewers were influenced more when the message came from the high dogmatic character than from the low dogmatic character. Clearly, entertainment television can be employed, perhaps inadvertently, to legitimize the anti-social opinions of certain viewers.

These studies, along with several other studies in the area, confirm some of the perceptions of popular critics of entertainment television. They provide empirical support for the critics' call on the television "authorities" to be sensitive to this problem when they create their programming content.

Footnotes

[1]Michael J. Arlen, "The Air," The New Yorker, November 22, 1976, pp. 184-194.

[2]Michael J. Arlen, "The Air," The New Yorker, December 6, 1976, pp. 192-203.

[3]Stuart H. Surlin, "Five Years of 'All in the Family': A Summary of Empirical Research Generated by the Program," paper presented to Speech Communication Association, Houston, Texas, December 1975.

[4]Stuart H. Surlin, "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie Bunker Case," Public Telecommunications Review, 2:34-41 (1974); Neil Vidmar and Milton Rokeach, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication, 24:36-47 (1974); Eugene D. Tate and Stuart H. Surlin, "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Viewer Agreement with Opinionated Television Characters," Journalism Quarterly, 53:199-203 (1976).

[5]John D. Leckenby, "Attribution of Dogmatism to TV Characters," Journalism Quarterly, in press.

[6]Eugene D. Tate and Stuart H. Surlin, "'All in the Family': Is Archie Funny?" Journal of Communication, 26:61-68 (1976).

[7]John C. Brigham, "Ethnic Humor on Television: Does it Reduce/Reinforce Racial Prejudice?," paper presented to American Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois, August 1975.

[8]Stuart H. Surlin, "'All in the Family' and 'Sanford and Son': Communication and Social Effects," paper presented to Southern Speech Communication Association, Tallahassee, Florida, April 1975; and John D. Leckenby and Stuart H. Surlin, "Incidental Social Learning and Viewer Race: 'All in the Family' and 'Sanford And Son'," Journal of Broadcasting, 20:481-494 (1976).

[9]Whereas the F Scale measures right-oriented authoritarianism, Rokeach's concept of dogmatism is considered to be direction-free and, thus, a generalized authoritarianism. Ralph B. Vacchiano, Paul S. Strauss, and Leonard Hochman, "The Open and Closed Mind: A Review of Dogmatism," Psychological Bulletin, 71:261-273 (1969); and Milton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monograph, 43:70 (1956).

[10]A. Scodel and P. Mussen, "Social Perceptions of Authoritarians and Nonauthoritarians," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52:92-95 (1956).

[11]W. H. Crockett and T. Meidinger, "Authoritarianism and Interpersonal Perception," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53:378-380 (1956).

[12]W. Rabinowitz, "A Note on the Social Perceptions of Authoritarians and Nonauthoritarians," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53:384-386 (1956).

[13]E. E. Jones, "Authoritarianism as a Determinant of First Impression Formation," Journal of Personality, 23:107-124 (1954).

[14]Theodore M. Newcomb, "Stabilities Underlying Changes in Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66:376-386 (1963).

[15]Richard Christie and Peggy Cook, "A Guide to Published Literature Relating to the Authoritarian Personality Through 1956," Journal of Psychology, 45:171-199 (1958).

[16]Howard J. Ehrlich and Dorothy Lee, "Dogmatism, Learning, and Resistance to Change: A Review and a New Paradigm," Psychological Bulletin, 71:249-260 (1969).

[17]Stuart H. Surlin and Elizabeth Bowden, "The Psychological Effect of Television Characters: The Case of Archie Bunker and Authoritarian Viewers," paper presented to Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Mass Communication and Society Division, College Park, Maryland, 1976.

[18]John D. Leckenby, "Attribution of Dogmatism to TV Characters," Journalism Quarterly, 54:14-19 (1977).

[19]The dogmatism scale utilized was that developed by Schulze and designed specifically to assess dogmatism of college students. Schulze found a correlation of .76 between this short-form scale and the original long form developed by Rokeach. R. H. K. Schulze. "A Shortened Version of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," Journal of Psychological Studies, 13:93-97 (1962).

[20]John D. Leckenby and Stuart H. Surlin, "Race and Social Class Differences in Perceived Reality of Socially Relevant Television Programs for Adults in Atlanta and Chicago," paper presented to the International Communication Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1975.

[21]R. Shaver and P. Robinson, Measures of Socio-Psychological Attitudes, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1974).